

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-23 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended. Now new matter has been added. Support for these claim amendments can be found, at least, in paragraph ¶ [0031] and Figure 2 of the originally-filed Application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication No. W0 01/43031 listing Chin as the inventor ("Chin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, is representative of independent Claims 11, 18, and 22, and recites as follows:

1. A computer-implemented method comprising:
defining an opportunity class, wherein
the defining is performed at an integration server,
the opportunity class represents an opportunity, and
the opportunity class identifies a set of relationships of the opportunity
with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity; and
transforming data received from a source application, wherein
the transforming is performed at the integration server,
the data received from the source application is in a source format,
the transforming transforms the data received from the source application
from the source format into a common format, and
the common format is a format recognized by the integration server.

The Office Action relies on Chin to disclose the limitations of Claim 1. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, the cited sections of Chin fail to show, teach, or even suggest

the claimed transforming of data received from a source application, from a source format into a common format recognized by an integration server.

Chin provides a system utilized in the fulfillment of business needs and opportunities over the Internet. *See* Chin, Abstract. Chin's system includes a sponsor wishing to fulfill a business need or opportunity and recipients who assist in the referral process to locate a recipient to fulfill the business need or opportunity. *Id.* The Office Action asserts that the claimed transformation is an inherent process performed in Chin, since a transformation is merely a conversion of data from an electronic form in the registers or memories into a stored, transmitted, or displayed format. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the transformation operation, as recited in Claim 1, is not inherent in the teachings of Chin at least because this transformation includes a format conversion.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide that a transformation involves transforming the data received from a source application, from a source format into a common format that is recognized by an integration server. By contrast, the cited sections of Chin fail to teach any such transformation. In fact, the cited sections of Chin provide that interactions between a sponsor, recipients, and a referral system are enabled on a seemingly equal basis via the Internet. *See* Chin, p. 5. The cited sections do provide that interactions between the referral system and the computer systems used by sponsors and recipients are facilitated by email. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of email sent over the Internet does not require the transformation of data from one format into a common format in order to be recognized, as in Claim 1. *See* Chin, p. 7.

In addition, the act of having a sponsor log in to the referral system also fails to teach any sort of data transformation. This is because a log in process and the verification of account information do not require the transformation of information from one format into a common format in order to be recognized. Therefore, the use of email or the act of logging into a referral system both fail to teach a transformation operation that transforms data received from a source application, from a source format into a common format recognized by an integration server.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed transformation operation is also not inherent in the teachings of Chin. As disclosed above, the components of Chin's system interact with each other via email and the Internet. *See* Chin, p. 7. As such, Chin neither encounters nor recognizes any need for transforming data from one format into another. Moreover, transforming data from one format into a common format would not provide any added benefit to Chin's system, which already employs a single standard format to ensure compatibility. Therefore, Claim 1's transforming of data received from a source application into a common format recognized by an integration server is not inherent in any of Chin's teachings, nor would such a transformation find any particular use therein.

For at least these reasons, Chin fails to show, teach, or even suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom. Similarly, Claims 11, 18, and 22 contain limitations that are similar to Claim 1. Hence, at least for the reasons given for the allowability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 11, 18, and 22, and all claims depending therefrom.

Claim 8, as amended, is representative of independent Claims 15, 20, and 23, and recites as follows:

8. A method for data transformation, the method comprising:
receiving opportunity data from a source application, wherein
the opportunity data represents an opportunity, and
the receiving is performed at an integration server; and
transforming the opportunity data received from the source application into a
common format defined by an opportunity class, wherein
the opportunity class identifies a set of relationships of the opportunity
with a plurality of entities related to the opportunity,
the opportunity data received from the source application is in a source
format,
the common format is a format recognized by the integration server, and
the transforming is performed at the integration server.

The Office Action relies on Chin to disclose the limitations of Claim 8. *See* Office Action, pp. 4-5. However, the cited sections of Chin fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of Claim 8.

Claim 8 contains limitations comparable to those of Claim 1, particularly those limitations disclosing the transformation of opportunity data received from a source application, from a source format into a common format defined by an opportunity class, in addition to being recognized by the integration server. As discussed above, the cited sections of Chin fail to disclose any transformation of data as recited in Claim 8. In addition, the cited sections of Chin provide no inherency teaching of the claimed transformation of data, as recited in Claim 8. Therefore, the cited sections of Chin fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of Claim 8.

For at least these reasons, Chin fails to show, teach, or even suggest the limitations of Claim 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 8, and all claims depending therefrom. Similarly, Claims 15, 20, and 23 contain limitations that are similar to Claim 8. Hence, at least for the reasons given for the allowability of Claim 8, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 15, 20, and 23, and all claims depending therefrom.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the reason that Claims 7 and 14 are dependent upon allowable base Claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Ana G. Luther /

Ana G. Luther
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 61,704
Telephone: (512) 439-5094
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099